



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/423,858	02/25/2000	MAIWENN BONNET	32143-152042	7234
26694	7590	11/04/2003		
VENABLE, BAETJER, HOWARD AND CIVILETTI, LLP P.O. BOX 34385 WASHINGTON, DC 20043-9998			EXAMINER LEWIS, RALPH A	
			ART UNIT 3732	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 11/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/423,858

Applicant(s)

BONNET ET AL.

Examiner

Ralph A. Lewis

Art Unit

3732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Aug 12, 2003
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-28,32,35 and 37-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 25 and 26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 27 and 28 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9-24,32,35 and 37-40 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph**

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 8, line 4, it is unclear how the opening relates to that previously set forth in parent claim 1. Dependent claims must reasonably relate back to the claims from which they depend. In line 4, there is no antecedent basis for "the upper anterior part." In lines 5 and 6, there is no antecedent basis for "the lower part or slide."

### **Rejections based on Prior Art**

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -  
(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Strassheimer (4,785,948).

Strassheimer discloses a thermoplastic preform (note Figures 1, 2) comprised of a hollow tubular shape with variable wall thickness and having an opening 12 The

particular shape which applicant intends for the preform to be molded into fails to impose any objectively ascertainable structural distinctions from the preform disclosed by Strassheimer. Applicant is not entitled to patent on a known prior art piece of plastic, simply because applicant intends for that known prior art piece of plastic to be molded into some new shape.

The examiner readily admits that the preform shape of applicant's Figures 2A-2C is significantly different from the prior art and certainly appears patentable, applicant is encouraged to positively claim that perform shape with a reasonable degree of particularity. In regard to the interview of July 17, 2003, the examiner was under the impression that the discussed "opening" would be claimed with some sort of relationship to the claimed tubular shape as is illustrated in applicant's Figures 2A and 2B, but as it stands, simply calling for an "opening" which is clearly present in the applied art fails to provide for any objectively ascertainable structural distinction.

Applicant has argued in the past that the preamble limitation that the claimed preform is "for obtaining a personalized orthopedic or dento-facial orthopedic apparatus" inherently requires limitations regarding size and biocompatible materials. The examiner agrees, and asserts that the Strassheimer preform inherently meets such broad and undefined inherent limitations.

### **37 CFR 1.32 Declaration**

The examiner has carefully reviewed applicant's 1.32 declaration and is in full agreement with it. The examiner agrees that applicant has present patentable subject matter and has indicated many of the claims to be allowable. With regard to the rejected claims, however, the scope set forth reads on the prior art as applied in the rejections. These claims are too broadly worded.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 27 and 28 are allowed.

Claims 9-24, 32, 35 and 37-40 are objected to and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the claims from which they depend.


### **Action Made Final**

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to **Ralph Lewis** at telephone number **(703) 308-0770**. Fax (703) 872-9306. The examiner works a compressed work schedule and is unavailable every other Friday. The examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver, can be reached at (703) 308-2582.

R. Lewis  
November 3, 2003

  
Ralph A. Lewis  
Primary Examiner  
Au 3732